

From: Fowler, Adam L [mailto:ALF5@PGE.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 3:07 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Please Support Proposal 2-XA

Hello,

Let me begin this letter by telling you my family supports the "2-XA proposal. We love the Ocean as have many generations of our family. Safety is number one and Proposal 2-XA has the best arrangement to keep up it that way. If 2-XA is not passed many anglers will travel near or past the typical ability of a small vessel and more deaths will occur. In addition to the safety aspect of 2-XA we also know this proposal meets the MLPA act and will maintain and improve sustainable fisheries.

Please support the "2-XA proposal". My family spends countless hours enjoying ocean angling. My children have grown up with this pleasure and way of life. This is a healthy family focus which we do not want to lessened.

Sincerely,

Adam Fowler
Alameda, Ca

From: Adam Kondrashoff [mailto:adamdives@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 8:20 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Proposal 2-XA

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to ask for your support of proposal 2-XA. After reviewing the proposal, I feel that it is a balanced proposal, for conservation and open areas for fishing. I can only get out onto the ocean for fishing two or three times a year. When I am able to go, I do not want to have to take long boat rides in order to get to the fishing grounds, some of the other proposals seem to put the MPA's adjacent to popular fishing ports, cutting off access to most of the close fishing grounds, and creating a dangerous situation for the small boater who has to travel further on the ocean, in order to reach the fish outside of the proposed MPA.

Thank you,

Adam Kondrashoff

From: Andrew Daniels [mailto:ADaniels19@cox.net]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 9:12 AM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman

Subject: Please Support Proposal 2-XA of the MLPA

Requesting you help and support;

A great deal of time and effort has gone into Proposal 2-XA and we believe that it achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA and still has the support of a vast array of commercial and recreational fishermen/women and divers. We believe that it is by far the best proposal that places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the "High" level of protection.

Thank you in advance for your consideration and support.

Andrew M. Daniels & Family
9915 Javelin Way
Spring Valley, CA, 91977-6516
619-670-9915
adaniels19@cox.net

From: Hermoso, August [mailto:august.hermoso@qwest.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 10:10 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: I support Proposal 2-XA

On behalf of my 8 year old son, my 70 year old father, and I...PLEASE listen to the voices of the fisherman.

YES ON 2-XA

August Hermoso

Sacramento, CA 95827

From: Jennings, Brian (JBRL) [mailto:JBRL@chevron.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 6:25 PM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: Proposal 2-XA

Dear Sirs,

I want to express my support for proposal 2-XA. I ask that you please support this proposal also. I think that prop 4 would definitely not be the right way to go.

As the owner of a small fishing boat, I think prop 4 would jeopardize the safety of me and my passengers.

Thank You,
Brian Jennings
Concord, CA 94521

From: Brian Stompe [mailto:bkstompe@verizon.net]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 9:59 PM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject:

Dear Blue Ribbon Task Force:

Regarding fishing restrictions for the coast and setting up marine reserves, I as a sportsman and long time CA fisherman recognize the need for change.

I believe the best plan is the one designated, 2-XA.

I will appreciate your consideration and adoption of this plan.

On a related subject, the decimation of the salmon runs not only here but in OR, WN, BC and Alaska, which I realize is a complicated subject, but became aware of something that might be a significant factor while watching KQED tonight.

The show was about the Humbolt squid, which as you know is more frequently appearing in our waters and now in waters all the way up to Alaska as the oceans warm.

There were underwater shots of their voracious feeding and it was noted they sometimes feed heavily on bottom fish and other fish where they travel in schools that are growing in number.

Could these growing schools of voracious and very large Humbolt squid be decimating the salmon as they range through salmon's migratory routes, as well as eating a lot of food the salmon usually eat?

Thank you and best regards,

Brian Stompe
110 San Mateo Way
Novato, CA 94945

From: waxman19@comcast.net [mailto:waxman19@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 8:55 AM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike.Chrisman@resoucrs.ca.gov
Subject: FW: 2-XA

Subject: 2-XA

Date: Tue, 01 Apr 2008 15:25:25 +0000

I am writing in support of 2-XA for the following reasons. 2-XA achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MPLA,

2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game guidelines.

2-XA is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range of fishing user groups

2-XA places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the preferred size range.

2XA has the support of many in the conservation community.

Bruce Bowman
166 Sequoia Rd.
Hercules CA.

From: Bruce MacKimmie [<mailto:bmackimmie@sbcglobal.net>]

Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 6:42 AM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: Support of 2-XA

Just a quick note to let the powers that be know that I Bruce MacKimmie Voter, Taxpayer and Sport Fisherman support 2-XA. This is a quick note as I am going to work to pay for a boat, a slip, fuel, bait, tackle, lodging when it travel, food and much more. If you continue to close down recreational fishing in this State I will take my trickle down recreation dollars and spend them out of state.

That being said, I am off to work. I support 2-XA.

Bruce MacKimmie

From: B.A. Young [<mailto:hawaiianfishinboy@gmail.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 9:06 AM

To: MLPAComments

Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman

Subject: Support of Proposal 2-XA

Dear Blue Ribbon Task Force Members,

Our oceans are a viable source of food, income, and enjoyment for all to enjoy for years to come. Some from commercial interests and some from recreational interests, in addition to all of the related and supporting industries, including the small mom and pop tackle shop to the local fish marking selling only locally caught fresh seafood.

Being born and raised in Hawaii, I have learned at a very young age that the ocean is a viable source of food and enjoyment. We need to take care of our ocean and creatures living in our oceans. For years, Hawaii did not have any rules and regulations on fish caught, size limits, species fishing seasons, etc. as our ancestors, but are continually being developed in Hawaii as it is here in California. To ensure that our oceans can be enjoyed for years to come while assisting our supporting industries to remain in business, we need to find a balance. Temporarily closing portions of our waters as proposed in 2-XA demonstrates that a balance can be achieved. Closing portions of our waters while

leaving others open to fishing is a good balance to ensure our oceans will continue to be sustainable and keep the supporting fishing industries employed.

Please approve Proposal 2-XA as it is good for California.

Sincerely,

Bryan Young
1177 N. Central Ave.
San Jose, CA 95128

From: Cathal McPeake [mailto:cmcpeake@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 9:47 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: In support of MPLA proposal 2-XA

To the members of the Blue Ribbon Task Force,

As a certified scuba diver, recreational fisherman, conservationist and parent I would like to add my support to proposal 2-XA. I do not support proposal 4 as it does not offer a fair share of access to all of us who love the ocean and have a stake in keeping it healthy. Proposal 2-XA achieves a high level of protection while allowing us to continue diving and fishing for future generations. I feel that if any proposal other than 2-XA is passed it will be much harder my son and all kids to-day to bond with, explore and establish a respect for nature.

Yours sincerely,
Cathal McPeake

From: Christopher Matson [mailto:tarpitzdelnorte@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 5:46 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: proposal 2-XA

Hi there, my name is Chris Matson and I am a fisherman who lives in Los Osos, CA. I fish from San Diego to Fort Bragg and it is one of my favorite pastimes. I just wanted to take a quick moment to say that I support proposal 2-XA for the MLPA implementation.

I really want to conserve our resources, for myself and future generations, so that we may be able to fish forever. I'm sure proposal 2-XA will be the best for us. Please realize that many of us live to fish, it's more than a pastime, it's a way of life.

Thank you for your consideration,

Chris Matson

From: DAMyerCompany@aol.com [mailto:DAMyerCompany@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 4:36 PM
To: Mike Chrisman; MLPAComments
Subject: Support 2-XA

April 1, 2008

MLPA Commission,
Secretary Mike Chrisman

To whom it may concern,

May I reiterate, **I do not want any more restrictions on my right to fish.** After reviewing all the remaining MLPA proposals on the table, I again urge the members of the BRTF and the Fish and Game Commission to **support Proposal 2-XA.**

2-XA clearly meets and achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA without unnecessary overkill.

2-XA meets DFG feasibility guidelines and is enforceable which means it will have the support of the public.

The 2-XA is a solution to meeting the intent of ALL MLPA law while doing so with the smallest footprint. This still takes away a great deal of turf from consumptive users but if 2-XA maintains ALL conservation goals of the MLPA law, there is simply no need to shut down more areas than required.

Please convince me that there's no predetermined political agenda driving this MLPA process (based on the origins of the funding for the process) by supporting 2-XA which is clearly the best proposal on the table.

Sincerely,

Dale Myer
P.O. Box 153
Clayton, CA 94517

From: David Graham [mailto:grambo@pacbell.net]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 8:30 AM
To: Melissa Miller-Henson
Subject: MLPA

As a lifelong resident of California , I support the 2-XA proposal.

Thank You

David A. Graham

NE OUBLIE NEVER FORGET

From: dreamhawk [mailto:dreamhawk@prodigy.net]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 6:07 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject:

Dear Blue Ribbon Task Force,

I would like to take this opportunity to express my complete support for proposal 2-XA.

Option 2-XA is the only reasonable option. It protects our precious resources yet allows access to many fishing areas that are safely reachable in a trailer able sport fishing boat. It satisfies the Ca DFG's feasibility guidelines, and also satisfies the MPLA conservation goals. It has the majority of support from Coastal communities, sport & commercial fisherman, and many conservationist groups. It is easily enforceable, and meets the criteria for MPA coverage area.

Proposal 4 is completely unreasonable, and would eliminate my Families ability to safely reach the fishing grounds. Under proposal 4 I would not safely be able to take my wife & 12 year old daughter fishing our wonderful coastal area, which is not fair – considering Proposal 2-XA meets all of the criteria, and satisfies the many requirements set forth.

Quickly deteriorating ocean conditions would make returning from the fishing areas outlined in Proposal 4 completely unsafe. As everyone is aware, weather predictions are not always accurate, and I cannot and will not jeopardize my Families safety, having to travel so much further to access & return from the fishing grounds as outlined in Option 4.

My 50 years of life have been spent entirely in this state, and my wife and I earn above average income. My primary interest - and my Families primary interest have been being on the water, while fishing and enjoying our local coastal areas. The vast majority of our disposable income is devoted to boating and fishing related concerns. Proposal 2-XA would allow for some fishing close by, yet still meet all of the criteria of the MLPA goals. My Family would be able to continue our enjoyment of this activity. Proposal 4

would eliminate our ability to safely continue to enjoy our passion of fishing, and being on the water.

My 12 year old daughter Lea enjoys fishing, and loves to be on the ocean enjoying the beautiful scenery of our coast and its marine habitat. We have taught her to have a deep appreciation for our precious marine resources, just as my wife and I do. My entire Family is conservationists, and no one cares more about this precious resource. I want her to be able to continue to enjoy this wonderful resource, and Proposal 2-XA would safely allow for this, while meeting or exceeding all of the goals in the MLPA/MPA process.

Proposal 2-XA is the best choice for everyone.

Thanks for your time,
David B. Harper
& the Harper Family of Dave, Jan & Lea.

From: David Pope [<mailto:dpope@westminster-school.org>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 9:35 AM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: Support for MLPA North Central Coast Proposal 2-XA

To: MLPAI Blue Ribbon Task Force

As a land owner on the Mendocino coast in sub-region 1(Lone Rock Ranch adjacent to Sail Rock Ranch), I urge you to move forward proposal 2-XA to the Fish and Game Commission for ratification. I have been following the proceedings of your committee in determining the most effective protection of the nearshore environment and I believe it continues to be with the land stewards who have a deep commitment to this part of California.

Therefore 2-XA has my support.

Proposal 2-XA is preferable to the other proposals because:

1. 2-XA protects more net new habitat in sub-region 1. It sets out MPAs beyond existing de facto reserves. When added together with de facto reserves of Sail Rock and Richardson Ranches, the total net new protected areas exceeds the other proposals.

2. 2-XA recognizes that the Department of Fish and Game will continue to have limited staff and allows them to focus their efforts at limited public access points. It does not transfer the state's enforcement responsibilities to private individuals by exclusively zoning areas that are protected privately.

3. 2-XA uses only the "highest" zoning to achieve the maximum effect from MPAs. This approach has the highest probability of achieving MPA objectives in a reasonable period of time. Areas with lower zoning, which contribute to enforcement, management and evaluation overhead but have lower probability of impact, are not included.

Somewhere in the early stages of MLPAI in the North Central Coast region there was an unfortunate conflation of public access and MLPA goals. This is a distraction from the primary goals of the Act, which are to protect threatened habitat and rebuild ecosystems. MPAs in other parts of the world have been successful because of local support and active involvement. 2-XA recognizes that a few heroic preservation activists alone cannot be successful. 2-XA is the best creative solution that promises to unite fishers, conservationists and local residents.

Thank you for your consideration.

David Ratcliff Pope

Cc: Richard Rogers, California Fish and Game Commission

From: ulrido@fire2wire.com [<mailto:ulrido@fire2wire.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 10:20 AM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: <http://fire2wire.com>; gov.ca.gov/interact@fire2wire.com;
UNEXPECTED_DATA_AFTER_ADDRESS_IN_GROUP@.SYNTAX-ERROR; polet yonan
Subject:

I support Proposal 2-XA

It has the support of commercial and sport fishermen.

It has support of many in the conservation community

It is enforceable and will have broad public support.

Don Ulrich
Denair Ca.

From: Fernando Banaria [<mailto:FBanaria@co.merced.ca.us>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 10:49 AM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: Mike Chrisman
Subject: In Support of Proposal 2-XA

Dear sir,

Just wanted to write you an email that I strongly support MLPA Proposal 2-XA for the following reasons:

Proposal 2-XA is a well balanced and strong conservation proposal that does not have significant adverse socioeconomic impacts on commercial and/or recreational fishermen and divers but:

• Proposal 2-XA achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA • Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines • Proposal 2-XA is enforceable and will have broad public support • Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range of fishing user groups • Proposal 2-XA has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster • Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the "High" level of protection. • Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the "preferred" size range. • Proposal 2-XA has the support of a vast array of commercial and recreational fishermen/women and divers. • Proposal 2-XA and/or its individual components has the support of many in the conservation community.

Thank you for your serious consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,
Fernando Banaria

From: Frank.Cooley@sce.com [<mailto:Frank.Cooley@sce.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 12:59 PM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: Fw: Support for Proposal 2-XA

To Blue Ribbon Task Force:

The comments I submitted in support of Proposal 2-XA are my own, and do not reflect the views of my employer. The signature block on my original note is automatically generated on my e-mails and it was not removed in the note I sent to you expressing my personal views in support of Proposal 2-XA. Thank you for considering my comments in your deliberations.

Below is a copy of my note in support of Proposal 2-XA, with the signature block removed from the e-mail note. Please use this note in your public correspondence file regarding this matter.

----- Forwarded by Frank Cooley/SCE/EIX on 04/01/2008 12:52 PM -----

Frank
Cooley/SCE/EIX

To 04/01/2008 12:47 PM MLPAComments@resources.ca.gov

cc governor@governor.ca.gov,
Mike.Chrisman@resources.ca.gov

Subject Support for Proposal 2-XA

(Embedded
image moved (Embedded image moved to file: pic16433.jpg)
to file:
pic08544.jpg) FOR INTERNAL USE ONLY

To the Blue Ribbon Task Force:

I strongly urge you adopt Proposal 2-XA. This proposal is a well-balanced and strong conservation-minded proposal that avoids adverse and damaging impacts on commercial and recreational fishing. Most importantly, the Proposal 2-XA will achieve the goals of the MLPA and meet the Department of Fish and Game's feasibility guidelines in the most cost effective and societally beneficial manner. The proposal is enforceable and will have much broader public support than the other draconian measures your task force is considering.

Proposal 2-XA is the only measure that has a strong backbone of marine reserves in the core areas where a State marine reserve serves as the centerpiece of a MPA cluster. This places a strong emphasis on the total ecosystem's protection. It contributes to a network of MPAs in the preferred size range, which is why it is supported by a vast array of commercial and recreational fishermen and women.

The other proposals your task force is considering are inferior and for this reason fall short of the broad support Proposal 2-XA has in the community. Proposal 4 would close virtually all recreational bottom fishing in Duxbury reef, the most important fishing area north of Point Conception. This will shut down fishing out of San Francisco Bay.

Proposal 4 creates an MPA between Half Moon Bay and Ano Nuevo. However, this MPA is not needed to meet SAT conservation guidance and would have devastating impacts on the Pillar Point Harbor users of this area. In contrast, Proposal 2-XA offers good solutions at Bodega Bay and Half Moon Bay. Proposal 4 would close down fishing for small boaters and creates potentially unsafe conditions for them.

Proposal 4 and 13 both place an MPA at Saunders Reef. This is an area protected by natural winds and typically rough water in the region.

This would disadvantage fishermen and women in that area by disproportionately impacting an area that was severely under-represented on the Regional Stakeholder group.

Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal that would create an underwater park at Sea Ranch that is specifically designed for non-consumptive divers while leaving open the traditional public access used by consumptive divers south of Stewarts Point. This feature, coupled with the private lands to the south becomes a keystone MPA in the overall network. Proposals 4 and 13 impact recreational and commercial users to the highest degree by extending their SMR out to the state waters boundary. Only Proposal 2-XA strikes a real balance in this part of the study area. This is reflected in the broad support it is getting from local residents, land owners, fishermen and women, and conservationists.

I strongly urge that you adopt Proposal 2-XA.

Frank J. Cooley

From: herbert rodricks [<mailto:hrodricks@comcast.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 12:25 PM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; mikechrisman@resources.ca.gov
Subject: BLTR recommendation

After attending the MLPA meetings @ the Sheraton 4 Points hotel in San Rafael, I strongly urge your support and recommendation of Proposal 2XA as its the only one to have broad support (including the guidelines from F & G) and be enforceable. Thank you for all your hard work on this fiasco.
Herbert Rodrick
Tiburon, Ca

From: Jackson Chapman [<mailto:jackson.chapman@comcast.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 9:23 AM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: MLPA Recommendation

Sirs,

Please consider and select option 2-XA. It is the only option that is based on scientific evidence and takes a reasonable approach continuing recreational fishing along the California coast.

Consider:

- According to a recent study recreational fishing in California generates directly and Indirectly over 2 Billion dollars to the economy.
- That it meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines.
- That it is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range of fishing user groups.

Please vote for option 2-XA.

Captain Jack Chapman, Sacramento the River City Chapter
California Striped Bass Association

Fair Oaks, CA

From: Jim N/A [mailto:helicon01@pacbell.net]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 7:28 AM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: Mike Chrisman
Subject: Proposal 2-XA support

April 1, 2008

Dear BRTF Members,

Please pass proposal 2-XA to the Fish and Game Commission. It is the best proposal.

Thank You,
James Volberding

From: Jeff Richards [mailto:jwrichards2003@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 11:20 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: The BRTF must support Proposal 2-XA

Proposal 2-XA is the only viable proposal from the RSG's. 2-XA meets all of the spacing and sizing requirements of the MLPA while not disenfranchising the thousands of fisherman (who are also voters) that spend in excess of \$3 billion statewide and several hundred million in the NCC area.

Proposal 4 and 1-3 will cost jobs and taxpayers money through lost discretionary spending from the fishing community and lost license and tax revenues. Additionally unemployment benefits of the thousands of local people who will be out of work because of the demise of the commercial and recreational fishing industries.

Therefore I urge the BRTF to forward Proposal 2-XA in its present form on to the Fish and Game Commission.

Respectfully;

Jeff Richards

From: John Amey [mailto:johnamey@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 1:26 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Blue Ribbon Task Force

I would like to offer my full support for proposal 2-XA. This proposal, is the most balanced for all Californians.
Thank You,

John T. Amey

From: Joseph Conte [mailto:jcontemail@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 11:50 AM
To: MLPAComments; Governor; Mike Chrisman
Subject: 2-XA

Please help us support 2-XA

Proposal 2-XA is a well balanced and strong conservation proposal that does not have significant adverse socioeconomic impacts on commercial and/or recreational fishermen and divers but:

Proposal 2-XA achieves the scientific and conservation goals of♣ the MLPA

Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility ♣ guidelines

Proposal 2-XA is enforceable and will have broad public support ♣

Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range ♣ of fishing user groups

Proposal 2-XA has a strong backbone of marine ♣ reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster

Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on total ♣ ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the “High” level of protection.

♣ Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the "preferred" size range.

Proposal 2-XA has the support of a vast array of ♣ commercial and recreational fishermen/women and divers.

Proposal 2-XA ♣ and/or its individual components has the support of many in the conservation community.

Major differences between 2-XA and other proposals:

♣ Proposal 4 would close virtually all recreational bottom fishing at Duxbury Reef – the most important fishing area north of Point Conception and mean the virtual end of fishing out of San Francisco Bay.

Proposal 4 creates an MPA between ♣ Half Moon Bay and Ano Nuevo (in the Central Coast study area) which is not needed to meet SAT conservation guidance, with devastating impacts to Pillar Point harbor and users.

Proposal 2-XA has good solutions at Bodega Bay and ♣ Half Moon Bay whereas Proposal 4 would be devastating for the small boater and actually creates unsafe situations

Proposals 4 and 13 both place an MPA at ♣ Saunders Reef (an area protected by natural winds and typically rough water) resulting in a disproportionate impact to an area that was severely underrepresented on the Regional Stakeholder Group.

Proposal 2-XA is the ♣ only proposal to create an underwater park at Sea Ranch specifically designed for non-consumptive divers while leaving open the traditional public access used by consumptive divers south of Stewarts Point, and when coupled with the private lands to the south becomes a keystone MPA in the overall network. Proposals 13 and 4 impact recreational and commercial users to the highest degree by extending their SMR out to the state waters boundary. Only Proposal 2-XA has struck a real balance in this part of the study area which is reflected in a massive support

from local residents, land owners, fishermen, and conservationists.

From: corderok1@verizon.net [<mailto:corderok1@verizon.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 8:49 PM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: Protecting our ocean the right way!

Please support proposal 2-XA. It achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA and meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines while still being enforceable. This is the most likely proposal to gain support from fishermen, environmentalists, and the general public. It protects economic interests around the bay area.

Thank You,
Ken Cordero (lifelong fisherman, environmentalist, and resident of California)
28 Corona Ct.
Novato, CA 94945
(415) 246-2530

From: kevin callanan [<mailto:kcall1954@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 5:57 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject:

Please adopt MLPA Plan 2XA. I own homes on the Mendocino Coast and Petaluma. This area is loved and nurtured by those in the area. Do the right thing.

Thank you,
Kevin Callanan

From: Dobbs, Lynn (LDOB) [<mailto:LDOB@chevron.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 7:05 PM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: Proposal 2-XA

Dears Sirs,

I would like to express my support for the proposal 2-XA. I would like for you to please support this proposal also. My family and myself fish a lot. I think that prop. 4 would definitely not be the correct way to go. Our safety could be jeopardized fishing in our small family boat.

Thank you,

Lynn Dobbs
241 Sharon Ave
Rodeo, Ca. 94572

From: Matt Bowman [mailto:matt95688@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 12:11 PM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: 2-XA - - Yes !!

Dear Sirs,

I am a sport fisherman, getting out in my boat just a few times a year.

I ask that you please support "**prop - 2-XA**". We who enjoy fishing could live with this "prop".

Prop 4 would be terrible for all who fish ! It would make fishing very dangerous for small "trailerred" boats as we'd be taking our boats into waters unsafe for small boats.

Thank you for listening!

Matt Bowman
Vacaville, Ca

From: Matthew Plut [mailto:sw44magnum@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 1:06 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Please Support Proposal 2-XA for the NCC MPA

I am a recreational fisherman, diver and a member of Coastside Fishing Club.

I am writing to urge the members of the BRTF and the Fish and Game Commission to support **Proposal 2-XA** because it not only satisfies, but exceeds the criteria defined for marine reserves by achieving a "High" level of protection while also satisfying the size and spacing requirements. It also meets the Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines.

Proposal 2-XA has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a

State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster while placing an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPA's in the preferred size and spacing range.

Having watched the last two meetings via webcast, it is clear to me Proposal 1/3 is incomplete. Nonetheless it encompasses about 22% of the coastline and is much more restrictive the public as a whole.

The most restrictive, Proposal 4, manages to encompass about 27% of the coastline. This would effectively make the North Central Coast region a look, but do not touch, aquarium.

In contrast to Proposals 1/3 and 4, which extend SMR's out to the state water boundaries and severely impact commercial and recreational users alike; **Proposal 2-XA** has struck a balance which places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection while achieving the desired "High" level of protection. **Proposal 2-XA** also affords the small boater safer access at Bodega Bay and Half Moon Bay.

Proposal 2-XA is a strong, well balanced conservation proposal without the significant adverse socioeconomic impacts of Proposals 1/3 and 4 on commercial and/or recreational fishermen and divers.

It is for all of these reasons that there is massive support from local residents, land owners fishermen and conservationists for **Proposal 2-XA** and I strongly urge you to support **Proposal 2-XA**.

Respectfully,

Matthew S. Plut

From: MERLE JACOBSON [<mailto:sandbox@earthlink.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 1:20 PM
To: MLPACComments; governor@governor.ca.gov;
Mike.Chrisman@resources.ca.go
Subject: A Plea in support of Proposal 2-XA

This proposal is a well balanced and strong conservation proposal that does not have significant adverse socioeconomic impact on commercial and/or recreational fisherman. It provides a win/win approach for all concerned without the devastating effect of taking away a constitutionally guaranteed right, not to mention an age-old and revered pastime and American tradition.

Merle Jacobson (wife of a environmentally sensitive and impassioned fisherman)

From: Shephard, Michael [mailto:mshephard@bofasecurities.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 6:28 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Proposal 2-XA

This is the right choice!!!

From: Mike Elfers [mailto:elf279@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 7:40 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject:

Dear Blue Ribbon Task Force,

I support Proposal 2-XA. I support MPA's where reasonable, and supported by science. I am a firm believer in maintaining healthy fish population levels.

As a recreational angler I believe strongly in marine conservation but

I would also like to see and live in a world where a mom and dad could teach their children about the ocean and still safely fish near ports and access points.

I believe Proposal 2-XA is the most reasonable, achieving the goals of the MLPA, meets DF&G guidelines, puts restrictions where they will help the most - and is supported by sound scientific models, has been peer reviewed by those who most understand the marine ecosystem, and yet still allows for reasonable fishing opportunities.

Thank you,

Mike Elfers
Vacaville, CA

From: PARKS-Rancatore, Mike [mailto:mrancatore@burlingame.org]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 8:25 AM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: MLPA proposal

Blue ribbon task force;

I have sport fished the bay area and ocean for thirty years. My self, friends and our children have acquired a great knowledge of our resources. we have had the pleasure of knowing and fishing with many people who have vast experience enjoying and making a living on the ocean. We understand that changes need to be made to ensure a strong fishery, so we support proposal 2-XA

Please keep in mind that education of our children is our best protection to the environment and the weather determines what days we can fish safely in a small boat, especially with children on board. This is just one reason proposal 4 is totally unacceptable to us with huge closures close to safe harbors, causing more fuel usage, longer rides in possibly dangerous ocean conditions, and most important; leaving the kids at home playing video games.

Thank you for your work on this important issue.
Mike rancatore

From: lucky50@humboldt1.com [<mailto:lucky50@humboldt1.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 4:04 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: RE: North Central Coast MLPA

To whom it may concern,
After discussing the MLPA options for the North Central study area with commercial fishing stakeholders in the region I've concluded that option 2XA is preferable.
With State, federal and local governments currently operating with deficits in the trillions of dollars, increasing regulations in the form of closed areas will only increase these deficits by adversely impacting businesses in California. Considering that nearly 85 percent of the Shelf and Nearshore waters are already closed to bottom-fishing in the form of RCA's, MPA's, YRCA's and Cowcod closure areas and since all groundfish populations are increasing the creation of any new MPA's is unnecessary.
Since it is quite unlikely the "no change" option will be adopted, option 2XA appears to be the least detrimental to business and still fulfil the goals of the unconstitutional Marine Life Protection Act.
Mike Zamboni
F/V Lucky 50

From: oceanview [<mailto:oceanview@solanowireless.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 3:39 PM
To: Mike Chrisman; MLPAComments
Subject: Proposal 2-XA

I am in support of Proposal 2-XA. I've been ocean fishing since I can remember. I now take my son fishing and took my daughters as well when they were younger. I understand issues behind conservation and know it is important. Having areas close to harbors to fish is the safest for many. I won't take my son or any family out to far for safety reasons. A lot of people feel this way. Proposal 2-XA would be the right answer.

From: Paul Matsubu [<mailto:paul@matsubu.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 1:04 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Proposal 2XA

Dear sirs, please support proposal 2XA. As a former commercial fisherman and a current recreational fisherman, I and my family beg you to choose a proposal that best suits the needs of the average family and fisherman. Proposition 2XA is the fair choice. Proposition 2XA will have broad public support. One of my sons who is a marine fisheries major at Humboldt State thanked me for not just giving him fish but teaching him to fish, a lesson that certainly has helped to raise

him as a provider and a contributing part of our society. Please allow future generations to experience these valuable lessons.

Thank you for your time,
Paul Matsubu

From: Pete Alsing [mailto:pjalsing@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 1:57 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: support for Option 2XA

Dear Blue Ribbon Task Force,

Please accept my support for Option 2XA. It is apparent that this option is the best thought out, the most inclusive of all user groups and the best at striking that delicate balance between ecology and access. It meets and exceeds the science and conservation goals of the MLPA, while incorporating the least socio-economic impact on sportsmen, coastal communities and marine related business.

Proposal 4 is completely unreasonable, and would eliminate my Families ability to safely reach the fishing grounds. Under proposal 4 I would not safely be able to take my wife & 12 year old daughter fishing our wonderful coastal area, which is not fair – considering Proposal 2-XA meets all of the criteria, and satisfies the many requirements set forth.

Quickly deteriorating ocean conditions would make returning from the fishing areas outlined in Proposal 4 completely unsafe. As everyone is aware, weather predictions are not always accurate, and I cannot and will not jeopardize my Families safety, having to travel so much further to access & return from the fishing grounds as outlined in Option 4

thanks for your time,
Peter Alsing

From: Peter Levitt [mailto:peter.levitt@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 6:52 PM
To: MLPAComments; Karen Adelman; The Amzel's
Subject: Proposal 2-XA

BRTF

I urge you to approve Proposal 2-XA. It meets and exceeds the science and conservation goals of the MLPA, while incorporating the least socio-economic impact on fishermen, coastal communities and marine related business. It strikes a balance between preservation, conservation, and sustainable use; the other proposals do not.

Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines and it is enforceable. This is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range user groups.

Thanks for your Consideration

Peter Levitt
Saul's Restaurant
Berkeley, Ca.

From: Raltongriffin@aol.com [mailto:Raltongriffin@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 4:31 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: proposal 2-xa

Dear Members:

I would like to thank all of you for the efforts you have put out on behalf of all the recreational boater's and fisherman on the West coast, you have to have at the very least a difficult job and we all owe you great deal of thanks. I have reviewed all the proposals and would like to let you know that I support 2-AX I feel that it supports all the scientific goals of MLPA and the DFG guidelines and it is the only proposal that can be enforced and receive the wide support of the commercial and recreational fisherman, 2-XA is the only proposal that address all areas without decimating the fisheries.

Ray A Griffin
Raltongriffin@comcast.net

From: Rick Ross [mailto:rickross@astound.net]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 5:53 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA 2-XA

As a recreational fisherman I would like to show my support for Proposal 2-XA. I'm sure the environmental community would like to see the pacific ocean completely closed but there are many more people involved then just them.

Sincerely,
Richard D. Ross

From: Richard Navarro [mailto:rnavarroelectric@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 7:03 AM
To: Melissa Miller-Henson; MLPAComments; Mike Chrisman
Subject: 2-XA

Please help us fisherman keep a little bit of our resource and vote for 2-XA. It is the only reasonable option for us recreational fisherman that would keep us safe with reasonable fishing grounds. 2-XA will be something that we all can live with and can all be proud off.. Thank you for your time.

Rich Navarro
Navarro Electric

From: Richard Shafer [mailto:graniteelectric@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 10:38 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Support of Proposal 2XA

I am a kayak fisherman, abalone diver and spear fisherman, underwater photographer, and (best of all) a father of 2 healthy children. I would like to voice my support for Proposal 2XA for the following reasons:

I was taught to fish by my father in upstate New York where I grew up. We fished the local creeks and lakes together and he imparted the wisdom of conservation of the resource to me – *don't take more than you need*. I have been fishing that way ever since and now I'm teaching the same ethic to my kids. My 7 year old has been out with me on my kayak; we've launched at Linda Mar in Pacifica where we live, and also at Salt Point where we enjoy frequent camping trips. I fish and dive the San Mateo coast and the Salt Point area spring, summer, and fall. To close down a huge area of Salt Point would be a dangerous proposition; Fisk Mill Cove is the only safe area to dive during periods of rough water (which is a good deal of the time). Fisk Mill is the *only* place I will want to bring my kids when they are learning to dive.

Closing down vast areas of the shoreline to fishing is totally unfair to shore fishermen, and blatantly biased against those that cannot afford a boat to get to deeper water.

Proposal 2XA provides the recreational opportunities that places like Pacifica and the Salt Point area need to help maintain their economies. And it provides for a series of reserves and protected areas that will insure those economies will be strong far into the future.

Many people learn to appreciate nature by learning to fish. If I take my kids out to look at the ocean they say, "Great dad. Now can we go home?" If I take them out fishing, I can't get them to leave. It is a great way to introduce youngsters to nature and teach them how to conserve it and appreciate it.

Please be fair to all the people who enjoy fishing, diving, and kayaking in our beautiful North Coast waters, and support Proposal 2XA. It is a fair balance of recreation and conservation. It insures longevity of the resource but allows the recreation that introduces future generations to that resource, so that they may learn to appreciate it and help to sustain it.

Richard Shafer
Pacifica

From: twounreel@aol.com [mailto:twounreel@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 11:23 AM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; MikeChrisman@resources.ca.gov
Subject: MPA'S For Central North Area

To: Blue Ribbon Task Force:

I am writing you in support of Proposal 2-XA for establishing MPA'S in the Central North areas. This proposal achieves the conservation goals

of the MPLA, meets the Department of Fish & Game's feasible guidelines, has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA'S cluster, places emphasis on total ecosystem protection and to a network of MPA'S in the "preferred" size range. This proposal, besides all of the above benefits, continues to strike a balance allowing the recreational and commercial fishing industries to operate with the least amount of adverse economic impact that is important to the present State's economic problems. It also supplies protected safe fishing areas for the small boat recreation fisher men and women. Lastly, Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to create an underwater park at Sea Ranch specifically designed for non-consumptive divers while leaving open the traditional public access South of Stewarts Point. When combined with the private lands to the south, it becomes a keystone MPA in the overall network.

Proposals 4 and 13 would close down both recreational and commercial fishing resulting in substantial social economic hardship on these industries and to the State's future financial health and make fishing in the few remaining areas very dangerous without substantially improving the benefit provided by Proposal 2-XA. Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal that strikes a real balance of conservation, ecological preservation and controlled use that is mandated by the MPLA. It is the only one that is strongly supported by local residents, land owners, consumptive users and conservationists.

Thank you for your support of Proposal 2-XA.

Robert W. Hetzler
Retired Marine Biologist, Industry Executive & Conservation Chairman
for the Tuna Club of Avalon, Huntington Harbour Anglers and Harbour Rod & Reel Club.

Tel: (714) 969-2570
e-mail: twoureel@aol.com

From: Rusty Reniers [<mailto:rustyr@mac.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 7:52 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Please Adopt Proposal 2-XA

Dear Blue Ribbon Task Force,

My family and I are following this issue closely. We all enjoy the ocean and the many things it offers. We support the 2-XA proposal and feel it does exceed all the requirements of the MLPA. Since we are in small boats all of the time, safety is a huge factor for us. Traveling long distances over open water is something we simply cannot do. Proposal 2-XA is the one that balances science and conservation. We encourage you to adopt Proposal 2-XA,

Sincerely,

The Rusty Reniers Family

From: Steve Balestrieri [mailto:oceanboy62@hotmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 7:45 PM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: Proposal 2-xa

Dear Blue Ribbon Task Force,

I would like to strongly voice my support for Proposal 2-XA. I find this proposal to be a well balanced strong conservation proposal that at the same time does not have significant adverse socioeconomic impacts on commercial and/ or recreational fisherman. I believe it would achieve the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA. Its enforceable and will have broad public support. It additionally places emphasis on total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on a high level of protection. I strongly urge the Task Force to stand behind this proposal. Thank you.

Respectfully

Steve Balestrieri

From: ANNIEWEIKEL@comcast.net [mailto:ANNIEWEIKEL@comcast.net]

Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 10:10 PM

To: Melissa Miller-Henson

Subject: Personal and Economic impacts MLPA will have on State and Myself

In a country, and at a time when both sides are complaining about special interests destroying our freedoms and way of life, this takes the cake. Personally I go fishing once a week during the spring and summer. I take along my wife and daughter, we have a blast. Sometimes we get a nice dinner to take home, but more importantly she gets to learn about life in real life. We go to the shoreline and look at the tide pools and I teach her about all the creatures living there and we get some mussels to eat, occasionally some fish, but we spend the day together enjoying what nature provided us as humans to consume. I also take out my best friends and sometimes new friends. We are very responsible, as I believe most recreational fisherman are. We can identify any species we catch and know all about the restrictions regarding them. I usually spend about 1,000-1,500 hundred dollars a month fishing, including boat payment, gas, truck gas, ! food, tackle, launch ramp fees, ice, dinner when done. If it was just me fishing that wouldn't be such an enormous loss to the state of California, bump that number up by about 5,000 boats state wide and that's a lot of money. Per year it's more than these groups are ponying up to close the fishing down. If that was the only source of loss to California it might not be so bad, but the loss of boat sales, tackle sales, gas taxes, sales taxes, charter boat operations, the loss of commercial fishing and the sales and taxes that they provide, harbors closing down due to decline in sales,(I took my boat out of water, 100 per month) and we'll be looking at billions of lost dollars for a economy ripe for a recession. Those are not the only sources of lost revenues for the state of California, many will move to a friendlier state and take their large incomes with them, many will spend their

money out of the country, many businesses will go out of business. If! this i s what the people of California wanted, it may not be such a big deal, but it's not, it's a movement of a few charities who

don't care what happens to this state. They have nothing to lose since they don't earn the money they are using to

impose their will. They are, and have broken rules and laws pertaining this agenda. They haven't listened to science or public input, and to top it off they only have to pay under a billion dollars to get their way. I wonder what the catholic church would do if they had chart Blanche to fund some of their special programs, or industrial company's, or lumber companies, I can think of a couple things they would do and they would have the same results as these groups. They would have the same negative impact on the little guy who makes this country and always gets the short end of the legal stick. I would implore you guys to think long and hard about making any closures until real science has been looked into.

Look at the financial impacts as the law requires, listen to the general public as they pay for everything in the end. Do we really want to continue letting special interest get their way to further destroy our way of life, I hope not. If you choose to do whatever it is you find so necessary to do, remember that when you don't get your way and don't be a hypocrite.

Personally, I feel this process has been handled unprofessionally, unfairly, and shoved unnecessarily down the wrong peoples throats, and if it goes down the way it looks like it will it will prove this state is incapable of governing itself with dignity, respect for citizens rights, in a constitutional manner , and I will not be sad when it collapses upon itself.

Thank you for your time if this letter is read. Steve Weikel Support 2-XA, Coastside fishing club member.

From: Tim Chavez [mailto:Tim@voicebroadcastingsolutions.com]

Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 12:38 PM

To: MLPAComments

Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman

Subject: Support for Proposal 2-XA

As a life long resident and fisherman of the SF bay area. I support the proposal 2-XA. I have been fresh water fishing ever since I could hold a fishing pole. My first salt water fishing trip was with the Fishing Club at Piedmont Hills Middle School in San Jose. We fished some bay area piers and also Pacific Pier. It was not until the fishing club took a party boat rock cod trip I knew I want a boat to fish the oceans. At age 8 I got a life time subscription to BASS Master magazine. Since the early 80s I have been reading Fish Sniffer Newspaper. At the age of 16 I purchased a vehicle which can pull a boat. By 17 I purchased my first small craft. At age 40 I know the importance of safe close areas to fish. The weather service is not always right and things can change quickly. Proposal 2-XA provides areas close to harbors so those with small craft do not need to make a long run only to be caught in changing weather conditions. Or if they are out and the weather does start to change they could fish these closer areas (This may also be the reason for higher fish counts around harbors). Looking between Proposal 2-XA and Proposal 4 they are some what similar. The difference which I see only someone who has put in time on the water or have read fishing reports all of their life would see. Seems like those who worked on Proposal 2-XA were

thinking of conservation, safety and the economy. Those working on Proposal 4 were going for numbers, land grab and a feather in their hat.

Tim Chavez

From: Tim McRitchie [mailto:tim_mccritchie@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 10:06 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Fishing Area Closures

Dear Sirs,

The suggested marine closures along our coastline are very sad. As a lifelong Californian and fisherman, I have fished the ocean for my entire life and have enjoyed it immensely. The different proposals put forth are at worst harsh, putting businesses that have been an important part of our economic makeup in a no win situation and possible failure. The mere thought of my children and future generations not being able to use this wonderful resource or being tightly restricted is something that I just can't wrap my mind around. The one proposal that does seem to make the most sense is 2XA, allowing for enough access yet meeting the requirements set forth by mandate. I ask that you take a good long look at this proposal 2XA, for it seems by far the most logical of any put forth. Thank you for your time.

Tim McRitchie

From: Tim Corfey [<mailto:tcorfey@alamedanet.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 8:59 PM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: Mike Chrisman
Subject: Please vote yes for proposal 2-XA

To MLPA task force members,

The more I look at these MLPA proposals the more frustrated I get, 2-XA is the only balanced proposal. The others are seeking to not only cut off access to every reef on the North Coast they are seeking to push our California Recreational ocean fisherman off the water. That was not the intention of the MLPA process it was supposed to be a balanced approach designed to help set aside areas for protection and recovery. The only proposal that follows through on this is 2-XA. The other proposals seem to be mean-spirited attempts to shut down all available fishing areas forcing families to forego the wonderful bonding experience that recreational ocean fishing is. It is a travesty when people have a chance to make positive change and turn it in to a personal vendetta.

Shame on those other proposals that try to push a political agenda instead of trying to build a balanced and reasonable solution to help the California we all know and love.

Kindest Regards,
Timothy Corfey
Alameda CA

From: Tony Koregelos [mailto:ihookem@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 4:13 PM
To: Mike Chrisman; MLPAComments
Subject: Proposal 2xa

To whom it may concern,
Everyday I read about all the management actions taken by the state to try and protect our fisheries. It seems that most of the options are more like shutting down our fisheries and making it hard to almost impossible for the small boater to enjoy a weekend out on the water. Fishing is a great past time and part of the reason I chose to stay in Northern California and raise my family. I wanted them to have a chance to enjoy all that the Ocean has to offer. Please take consideration in Proposal 2XA as for it is the only option that seems to make a rational proposal among this whole process which does not make much sense at all.
Sincerely
Tony Koregelos

From: Vanessa Barrington [mailto:vanessa@vanessabarrington.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 1:19 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: About the blue ribbon task force on fisheries.

I urge you to approve Proposal 2-XA. It meets and exceeds the science and conservation goals of the MLPA, while incorporating the least socio-economic impact on fishermen, coastal communities and marine related business. It strikes a balance between preservation, conservation, and sustainable use; the other proposals do not.

Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines and it is enforceable. This is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range user groups.

Best,
Vanessa Barrington

From: Walter [mailto:wwratcliff@earthlink.net]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 9:08 AM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman; 'Michael Valentine'
Subject: Support for MLPA North Central Coast Proposal 2-XA

To: MLPAl Blue Ribbon Task Force

As a land steward on the Mendocino coast in sub-region 1, I urge you to move forward proposal 2-XA to the Fish and Game Commission for ratification. I have written to and testified before your committee that the most effective protection of the nearshore environment has been and

continues to be the land stewards who have a deep commitment to this part of California. 2-XA has our support.

Proposal 2-XA is preferable to the other proposals because:

1. 2-XA protects more net new habitat in sub-region 1. It sets out MPAs beyond existing de facto reserves. When added together with de facto reserves of Sail Rock and Richardson Ranches, the total net new protected areas exceeds the other proposals.
2. 2-XA recognizes that the Department of Fish and Game will continue to have limited staff and allows them to focus their efforts at limited public access points. It does not transfer the state's enforcement responsibilities to private individuals by exclusively zoning areas that are protected privately.
3. 2-XA uses only the "highest" zoning to achieve the maximum effect from MPAs. This approach has the highest probability of achieving MPA objectives in a reasonable period of time. Areas with lower zoning, which contribute to enforcement, management and evaluation overhead but have lower probability of impact, are not included.

Somewhere in the early stages of MLPAL in the North Central Coast region there was an unfortunate conflation of public access and MLPA goals. This is a distraction from the primary goals of the Act, which are to protect threatened habitat and rebuild ecosystems. MPAs in other parts of the world have been successful because of local support and active involvement. 2-XA recognizes that a few heroic preservation activists alone cannot be successful. 2-XA is the best creative solution that promises to unite fishers, conservationists and local residents.

Thank you for your consideration.

Walter W. Ratcliff
Sail Rock Ranch
Gualala, CA

Cc: Richard Rogers, California Fish and Game Commission

From: Wes & Bonnie Adams [<mailto:adamsbw@comcast.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 2:38 PM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: 2-XA

Dear Sirs,

In regards to Ocean Fishing closures off the California Coast, if passed Proposition 4 would end my family's ability to access areas where we have fished for decades. (We have purchased our grandchildren lifetime licenses, specifically for fishing in the ocean) Proposition 4 would make it impossible and unsafe to take my young children to these areas off Bodega Bay. Coastside Fishing Club's proposition 2-XA would at least salvage some of these important areas. 2-XA is founded in good sound science and is supported by many conservation groups and maybe just as important, by hundreds of California families such as mine.

Thank you for your consideration.

Wesley W. Adams, Sr

Bodega Bay, CA

From: wcm6@humboldt.edu [<mailto:wcm6@humboldt.edu>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2008 9:14 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: 2-XA

To Whom It may concern,

I am a fisheries biology student at HSU and an avid fisherman. I love to fish and can not see a life with out it. The best memories i have with my father and brother are while fishing. With prop 2-xa we will have the ability to fish and so will my kids and their kids.

William Matsubu
Concerned Citizen.

My name is Logan Dutra, and I am 6 years old. I love to go fishing with my Dad. My brother Cole wants to go fishing with us too. He is only 2 years old, so he can't write you a letter

My Daddy says that we need to support 2-XA, so that we can still go fishing. He says that he will explain it to you.

Logan

Logan

I transcribed the above from a conversation I had with my daughter. I am a third generation Californian who comes from a long line of ocean sport fishermen and divers. I firmly believe that sport anglers are the original and most passionate of conservationists when it comes to protecting oceanic species.

My family fishes the ocean aboard small sport boats (less than 30 ft long). As such, safety concerns necessitate that we not travel too far from harbor access points while fishing. Weather conditions can change rapidly on the ocean, and long afternoon runs in sloppy weather compromise safety. I bring this up due to the fact that 2-XA is the only proposal which provides us access to areas cherished for decades by my family. The other proposals, especially proposal 4 unnecessarily close much of the prime access within reach of our harbors.

Proposal 2-XA does an excellent job of protecting the resource while addressing the economic impacts of the MLPA. None of the other proposals provide this balance. As I understand the requirements of the MLPA, proposal 2-XA achieves both the conservation and scientific goals of the act, as well as meeting the feasibility guidelines established by the Department of Fish and Game.

In addition, proposal 2-XA appears to be the only proposal which has the support of a broad cross section of the California population, especially those (sport fishermen, commercial fisherman, divers, etc.) who regularly venture on or into ocean waters.

It is my firm belief that proposal 2-XA is the only proposal that should be considered by those ultimately making this decision.

Thank you for considering the concerns of our family.

Bill Dutra
250 Edinburgh Circle
Danville, CA 94526